inquire of the gentleman if the senators from Vermont did not vote for it?

Mr. STEPHENS: For what? Mr. MEACHAM. For the admission of

Mr. STEPHENS. I am not speaking of the Senate, but of the House. I have none but the House records before me. I am dealing with members in this body, or those who preceded us here. If the gentleman desires, he can answer for his predecessors from the State of Vermont on this floor.

The next time anything was said in our le gislation about the "Missouri line of 36° 30" was on the annexation of Texas. That measure was carried with that line in it, but not by the northern votes. It was the south, still willing to abide it, that carried it then. There were one hundred and twenty-five northern votes given on that occasion. Of these, only fifty-one were for the annexation with this line established in it; while there were seventy four, a large majority, who refused to give it their sanction. I do not mean to say that all who voted against that measure were opposed to that line of settlement. Many of them had other reasons. And I know full well, for I was here, that of those fifty-one northern men who voted for it, many of them would not have voted for the recognition of that line if the question had come up by itself. But those resolutions of annexation were so presented that they had to be taken as a whole, or not at all. I allude to this vote, merely because it was the next time in order when the question came up, and the vote certainly fails to show that the north, or even a majority of them, gave it their sanction. For that reason only I allude to it. I come down now to another step of our pro-

gress, to the period from 1847 to 1850. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Meacham] had a map for illustration, which he exhibited to us. He painted out to us the boundary of the Louisiana purchase. It commenced at the mouth of the Sabine, ran up that river to the 32° of north latitude: thence due north to the Red river; thence up that river to the 100° of west longitude from Greenwich; thence due north to the Arkansas river, and up that river to the 42° of north latitude, and thence due west to the south seas or the Pacific ocean. By this map, and his demonstrations from it, it appears that we had a title ceded to us from France to territory extending to the Pacific ocean. Well, that of course included Oregonthat is according to the gentleman's map, we derived title to Oregon under the cession from France in 1803, and that territory was part of the Louisiana purchase. Mr. Jefferson so considered it, and sent Lewis and Clarke to explore

the country.
Well, then, how did the south act towards this "solemn compact," as it is now called, the line of 36° 30', when we came to organize' a territorial government for Oregon in 1847 The southern boundary was the 42d° of north latitude, and of course the whole of it lay north of 36° 30'. At this time (in 1847) we were in a war with Mexico, and it was well understood to be the policy of the administration to acquire territory from that government, which, in all probability, would, to some extent, be south of the line 36° 30'. From the votes of the House, upon what was well known as the "Wilmot proviso," the south had just reasons to apprehend that it was the fixed determination of a majority of the north to disregard entirely what is now called the "sacred covenant of 1820." When, therefore, the bill to organize a territorial government for Oregon came up in this House, on the 15th of January, 1847, Mr. Burt, of South Carolina, to take the sense of the north directly upon the question of abiding by this line of 36° 30', moved, as an amendment to that clause in the bill which excluded slaery lorever from the Territory, these words: -" inasmuch as the whole of said Territory lies north of 36° 30' north latitude, known as the line

of the Missouri compromise.' The object of this amendment was to put a direct test to the north, whether they intended to recognise the principle upon which the controversy on the subject of slavery in the Territories was disposed of in 1820 or not. Sir, the north understood the question fully and clearly. and they met it promptly. Their response was, that they did not. Here is the vote upon this question: there were in this House then 82 votes for Mr. Burt's amendment, and 113 against it! Of these noes, every man was from the north. Every southern man in the House voted for it. And of the 82 who voted to ad bere to the principle of that adjustment, not as something too sacred to be touched, but for the sake of peace and quiet, there were, I believe, but six from the whole north; they were Douglas and Robert Smith, from Illinois; Cunningham and Parish, from Ohio: Charles J Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania; and Hastings, of Iowa. Every man from Vermont and New York voted against it.

In the face of this record, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEACHAM] and the gentleman from New York, [Mr. FENTON,] in their places upon this floor, two days ago, declared "Missouri compromise" had met the approval of the north for thirty years. The south, in this instance, proposed it unanimous-ly as a "peace offering," and it was almost as unanimously rejected by the north. "Honor," I think the gentleman said. They rejected it over territory to which we derived title by the very cession alluded to in the act of 1820. And so thoroughly opposed were they to giving it their approval, and so bent upon its total abro gation, that they refused to affirm the principle when they got all by the affirmation. "Honor, indeed! But, sir, to proceed. This bill was defeated in the Senate. I believe. It did not become a law. The question came up again in 1848. Another bill was brought forward to establish a territorial government for Oregon. The Senate put in the following amendment:

"That the line of 36° 30' of north latitude known as the Missouri compromise line, as defined by the eighth section of an act entitled . An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to pro-hibit slavery in certain Territories, approved March 6, 1820, be and the same is hereby declared to extend to the Pacific ocean; and the said eighth section, together with the compromise therein effected, is hereby revived, and declared to be in full force and binding for the future organi-zation of the Territories of the United States, in the same sense and with the same understanding with which it was originally adopted.

It came up for action in this House on the 11th of August, 1848. On the question to concur with the Senate in this amendment, the yeas were 82, and the nays 121. I have the vote before me. This was a proposition to revive and declare in force a provision which is now claimed to have been held all the time as a sacred compact, almost as sacred as the Constitution itself; and it was rejected by an over-whelming majority in this House—rejected, sir, by the north. . The south was again unanimous for it. From the north at this time, I think, there were but four votes for it-Bird sall, from New York; Charles Brown, Charles J. Ingersoll, and Brodhead, from Pennsylvania. Here is the journal. This proposition in the Senate was moved by Mr. Douglas. It received every southern vote in that body, and was opposed by every northern vote, except Douglas, Dickinson, Bright, Cameron, Hanne gan, Sturgeon, and Fitzgerald. The vote on the adoption of it in that body was 33 to 21. Mr. Calhoun, who was well known to be op-posed to the principle on which it was founded, vet gave it his support.

Mr. MEACHAM, (interrupting.) I would them, rise up here and say that this compromise of the gentleman if the senators from mise has been undisturbed and acquiesced in for thirty years? But, sir, there is still another

chapter in this history.

At the close of the war with Mexico, extensive territories, as was expected, were acquired—territories extending south as well as orth of the line of 36° 30', constituting a public domain of hundreds of thousands of square miles, purchased by the common blood and common treasure of the people of the south as well as the north. The policy of the advocates of the "Wilmot proviso," from the beginning, had been to appropriate the whole of this im-mense region exclusively to the north. Hence their uniform hostility to the Missouri compro-mise, because that was founded upon the principle of division. Their determination was to have all. The south was still willing to divide, notwithstanding the policy which she ever advocated was to leave all the Territories open for the occupancy and colonization of the people of the whole country, from whatever sec tion they might emigrate, with the liberty of forming such institutions, upon a republican basis, as they might deem most conducive to their happiness, interest, and prosperity, without any congressional restriction or dictation whatever. This was always the doctrine main tained at the south. She was willing to divide only as an alternative between that and a reater evil. To an entire exclusion, by act of Congress, she had made up her mind never to submit, let consequences be what they might. This was the state of things upon the assembling of the thirty-first Congress. The events of that Congress are too recent and vivid upon the recollection of all to need rehearsal. The majority of the north still proclaimed their determination to appropriate the whole of the public domain to themselves. Both sections tood in hostile array against each other. The strife became so embittered and fierce that legislation was paralyzed, and everything seemed o threaten confusion and anarchy. The south again repeatedly proposed a settlement upon the Missouri line. The proposition was made in this House, on the part of the south, for the last time, on the 13th day of June, 1850. It was in these words:

"Provided, however, That it shall be no objection to the admission into the Union of any State which may hereafter be formed out of the territory lying south of the parallel of latitude of 36 degrees 30 minutes, that the constitution of said State may authorize or establish African slavery

This proposition was rejected in Committee of the Whole upon a count by tellers-ayes 78, noes 89. It was the last time, sir, it was ever offered. When the north had again, and again, and again, for three years, refused to abide by it, the south, driven to the wall upon it, was thrown back upon her original rights under the Constitution. Her next position was, that territorial restriction by Congress should be to-tally abandoned, not only south of 36° 30′, but north of that line, too! Upon this ground she lanted herself on the 15th day of June-the debates in this House on that day were more exciting, perhaps, than ever upon any day since the beginning of the government. It was upon that day I put the question directly to a distinguished gentleman then here from Ohio, [Mr. Vinton, whether he would vote for the admission of any slave State into the Union, and he refused to say that he would. The de-termination, as manifested by the votes of the majority of the north, was to supply legislative restriction over the whole of the common territory, in open and shameless disregard of the principle of the so-called Missouri compromise otwithstanding the gentleman from Vermon says that it has been adhered to and held inviolate for thirty years. It was on that day sir, that a distinguished colleague of mine, [Mr Toombs, then on this floor, now in the other wing of the Capitol, made that speech which which he said, with eloquence seldom heard

"We do not oppose California on account of the anti-slavery clause in her constitution. It was her right, and I am not even prepared to say that she acted unwisely in its exercise—that is her business. But I stand upon the great principle that the south has a right to an equal participation in the

Deprive us of the right, and appropriate this common property to yourselves, it is then your government, not mine. Then I am is enemy; and I will then, if I can, bring my children and my constituents to the altar of liberty, and, like Ha nilcar. I would swear them to eternal hostility to nd we are ready, as ever heretofore, to stand b the Union, every part of it, and its every interest refuse it, and, for one, I will strike for independ

It was then, when the north had refused all compromise, and went into the contest for "the whole or none," that the south took up the gage, planted herself upon her original ground, armed, as she conceived, in the panoply of truth and her representatives, boldly meeting those arrayed not only against her rights but a grea principle of free government face to face, said "Lay on, Macduff; And damn'd be him that first cries, Hold, enough:

The grounds she then took were, that there should be no settlement of this territorial controversy but upon the recognition of her origi nal principles, which were, that all congres sional restrictions upon this subject were wrong and should be totally abandoned. This wathe basis of her ultimatum, as then proclaimed It was offered in this House on the 15th day o June, 1850. No decision was had on it. I was offered two days after in the Senate to the then pending compromise bill in the Senate. This proposition was in these words:

"And when the said territory, or any portion of the same shall be admitted as a State, it shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, their constitution may prescribe at the time of

The whole question of slavery or no slavery was to be left to the determination of the peo ple of the Territories, whether north or south of 36° 30', or any other line. The question was to be taken out of Congress, where it had been improperly thrust from the beginning, and to be left to the people concerned in the matter to decide for themselves. This, I say, was the position originally held by the south when the Missouri restriction was at first pro-posed. The principle upon which that position rests lies at the very foundation of all our republican institutions. It is that the citizens f every district and separate community or State should have the right to govern themselves in their domestic matters as they please, and that they should be free from the intermeddling restrictions and arbitrary dictation on such matters from any other power or government in which they have no voice. It was out of a violation of this very principle, to a great extent, that the war of the revolu tion sprung. The south was always on the republican side of this question, while the north—no; or, at least, I will not say the entire north, for there have always been some of then with the south on this question; but I will say, while a majority of the north, under the freesoil lead of that section, up to the settlement of the contest in 1850, were on the opposite side.

The doctrine of the restrictionists or free. soilers, or those that hold that Congress ought all cases. It was against that principle the to impose their arbitrary mandates upon the people of the Territories in this particular, whether the people be willing or unwilling, is the doctrine of Lord North and his adherents in the British Parliament towards the Colonies during his administration. He and they claimright to govern the Colonies But upon the rejection of this amendment by cases whatsoever," notwithstanding the want

if there be any here now who call themselves whigs arrayed against this great principle of republican government, I will do towards them as Burke did in England—I will appeal from

strictions or to pass the "Wilmot proviso," I have waived the issue; I never discuss it. On that point I have told my constituents, and I tell you, I treat it as Chatham treated it in the British Parliament when the question of power to tax the Colonies without representaon was raised there. That was a question which Chatham would not discuss; but he told those who were so unjustly exercising it that if he were an American he would resist it. The question of power is not the question; the juestion is, is it right thus to exercise it? Is it consistent with representative republican government to do it? That is the question. Where do you latter-day whigs from the north stand on this question? Will you take the side of Lord North and the British tories, and maintain that it is the duty of this great government, with its superior wisdom, to legislate for the freemen of this country, as free-born as yourselves, who quit your State jurisdictions and seek new homes in the west?

And where do you, calling yourselves demo erats from the north, stand upon this great uestion of popular rights? Do you conside it democratic to exercise the high prerogative of stifling the voice of the adventurous pioneer, and restricting his suffrage in a matter confriends of the Nebraska bill, we think that our ellow-citizens who go to the frontier, penetrate the wilderness, cut down the forests, till the soil, erect school-houses and churches, extend States and empires, do not lose by their change of place, in hope of bettering their condition, ither their capacity for self-government or their just rights to exercise it conformably to the Constitution of the United States.

the African race amongst them, as well as upon other questions of domestic policy. If they see fit to let them hold the same relation to the white race which they do in the southern States, from he conviction that it is better for both races that they should, let them do it. If they see fit to place them on the same footing they occupy in the northern States—that is, without the rights of a citizen or the protection of a master, outcasts from society, in worse condition than Cain, who, though sent forth as a vagabond, yet had a mark upon him that no man should hurt him—I say, if they choose to put this un-fortunate race on that footing, let them do it. That is a matter that we believe the people there can determine for themselves better than we can for them. We do not ask you to force southern institutions or our form of civil polity upon them, but to let the free emigrants to our vast public domain, in every part and par-cel of it, settle this question for themselves, with all the experience, intelligence, virtue, and pariotism they may carry with them. This, sir, is our position. It is, as I have said, the origi nal position of the south. It is the position she was thrown back upon in June, 1850. It rests upon that truly national and American princile set forth in the amendment offered in the enate on the 17th of June, which I have stated and it was upon the adoption of this principle that that most exciting and alarming contro versy was adjusted. This was the turning point; upon it everything depended, so far as that compromise was concerned.

Jpon its rejection in the then state of the pubic mind depended consequences which no human forecast could see or estimate. The in-terest was enhanced from the great uncertainty and doubt as to the result of the vote. Several northern senators who had before yielded the question of positive restriction, that is the "Wilnot proviso," had given no indication of how they would act upon this clear declaration that the people of the Territories might, in the formation of their State constitutions, determine this question for themselves. Among these Mr. Webster. Just before the question was put, and while anxiety was producing its most torturing effects, this most renowned statesman from New England arose to address the Senate. An immense crowd was in attendance. The lobby as well as the galleries were full. All eyes were instantly turned to-wards him, and all ears eager to catch every word that should fall from his lips upon this he most important question, perhaps, which had ever been decided by an American Senate. His own vote, even, might turn the scale. That speech I now have before me. In it he delared himself for the amendment. His conclusion was in these words:

" Sir, my object is peace, my object is reconcilia tion. My purpose is not to make up a case for the north, or to make up a case for the south. My object is not to continue useless and irritating con-troversies. I am against agitators north and south. am against local ideas north and south, and gainst all narrow and local contests. I am an merican, and I know no locality in America. The is my country. My heart, my sentiments, my judgment, demand of me that I should pursue such a course as shall promote the good, and the harmony, and the union of the whole country. This I shall do, God willing, to the end of the

The reporter says: ["The honorable senator resumed his seat amidst the general applause of the gallery."] Yes, sir, he did. I was there, and witnessed the scene; and no one, I fancy, who was there, can ever forget that scene. Every heart beat easier. The friends of the measure felt that it was safe. The vote was taken, the amendment was adopted. The result was soon communicated from the galleries, and, finding its way through every passage and outlet to the ro-tunda, was received with exultation by the perhaps, the electric wires were trembling with he gladsome news to the remotest parts of the country. It was news well calculated to make nation leap with joy, as it did, because it was the first step taken towards the establishment of that great principle upon which this territorial question was disposed of, adjusted, and settled in 1850. It was a new step in our governmental history. From the beginning, no hing had been the cause or source of so much ectional feeling and strife as this question of slavery in the Territories, a question so nearly allied in principle to the old controversy be-tween the colonies and the mother country.

With the colonies the question was not so much the amount of taxation; it was not the small duty on tea, that was far from being oppressive, but it was the principle on which it was placed; it was the principle asserted and maintained in the "preamble," that our fore-fathers resisted by arms. And Mr. Webster that our forewell said, on some occasion, that the American revolution was "fought against a preamble." That preamble asserted the right, or power, of the home government to govern the Colonies in

war was commenced."

The cause of right in which the men of '76 engaged was vindicated in the success of the revolution and the disruption of the British empire. And, as a coincident worthy to be noted, it so happened that this kindred principle of the proper and just rights of the people of our territories, or colonies, made its first step towards ultimate success on the anniverthe House, and a disagreement between the two houses upon it, the amendment was lost, of the south upon this question has been, and sary of the battle of Bunker Hill. It was on

to be sanctioned by the representatives of the and the Oregon bill passed, and received the is, the doctrine of the whigs in 1775 and 1776. the ever memorable 17th day of June. It was are the reasons for it? The north, it is said, is those who espoused the side of the restriction sanctioned by the representatives of the gentleman's own State in 1836, the first time it came up again.

I will now go on, and show the gentleman and the House, when it came up again, and the House, when it was finally repudiated by the almost when it was finally repudiated by the almost entire north.

The north, it is said, government—attempting to compel the people of our Territories to adopt such institutions as may please a majority of Congress, without sulting the rights, interests, or wishes of "the new to the old whigs."

I say nothing of the constitutional view of the question. When I have been asked if Contra blow. It is fortunate for us, and fortunate for millions that shall come after us, that it was the newer to impose rethose immediately concerned—was, for the first time, abandoned by the American Senate withabandoned without a blow. Had the restrictionists of this country held out as Lord North's ministry did in their policy, it might have ended in consequences most disastrous to our common well-being and the hopes of mankind. But they did not. The power of truth prevailed. Patriotism trampled over faction. And as soon as this great American principle-I so call it because it lies at the foundation of all our republican institutions—was vindicated in the Senate, the House did not again resume the subject. We waited until the bills came from the Senate. The same provision as that I have read was put in the New Mexico bill. That swept away the restriction that had been put in the Texas annexation resolutions over all that part of Texas lying north of 36° 30', included in the present territory of New Mexico. The House took up these bills, after they were passed by the Senate with these amendments with this new principle incorporated in them and gave them their sanction

This, sir, is what is called the compromise of 1850, so far as this territorial question is con-cerned. It was adopted after the policy of dividing territory between the two sections, north and south, was wholly abandoned, discarded, and spurned by the north. It was based upon cerning his own interest, happiness, and government, which he is much more capable of taking this disturbing element out of Congress, leciding than you are? As for myself and the and leaving the whole question of slavery in the Territories to the people, there to settle it for themselves. And it is in vindication of that new principle, (then established for the first time in the history of our government,) in the year 1850, the middle of the nineteenth century, that we, the friends of the Nebraska bill, whether from the north or south, now call apon this House and the country to carry out n good faith, and give effect to the spirit and We of the south are willing that they should exercise it upon the subject of the condition of thing like Congressional restriction. This is what we wish to declare. And this principle, carried out in good faith, necessarily renders all antecedent legislation inconsistent with it inoperative and void. This, also, we propose

The restriction imposed by the eighth sec tion of the act of 1850, thrown into that act out of place and without any legitimate con-nexion with it, like a fifth wheel to a wagon, is just such antecedent legislation. The principle on which it was based has been abandoned, totally abandoned, as I have shown, by those who now contend for it, and superseded by another, a later, a better, and a much more national and republican one. We do not pro-pose to repeal "any compact," or to violate faith in any sense; we only invoke you to stand upon the territorial principle established by what is known as the compromise of 1850. That has already received the sanction of an overwhelming majority of the American people, as I doubt not it always will receive who fairly presented. I have seen it suggested that, if a proposition should be made to extend the provisions of this bill to the guaranty to the south in the Texas annexation resolutions for the admission of slave States from Texas south of 36° 30', such proposition would cer-tainly defeat it. By no means, sir; those who reason thus show nothing so clearly as how little they understand the real merits of the

That guaranty, secured in the Texas resolu I well recollect the intensity of interest felt tions, so far as the character of the institutions of such States hereafter to be formed is concerned-that is, whether they be slave or free is, itself, in perfect accordance with the present provisions of this bill. That guaranty was not that those new States should be slave States. but that the people there might do as they please upon the subject. The reason that the uaranty was important, at the time, was, be cause the policy of Congressional restriction had not then been abandoned. The south never asked any discrimination in her favor from your hands. All that the south secured by those resolutions, so far as the character of the States is concerned, was, simply, that they should be admitted at a proper time, "either with or without slavery," as the people may determine. As to the number of States, that is a different question. So that if you should repeal that so-called guaranty for slave States, by extending this bill to that country, you would only erase to fill again with the same words. We ask no discrimination in our favor; and all we ask of you men of the north is, that you make none in your own. And, why should you? Why should you even have the desire to do it? Why should you not be willing to remove this question forever from Congress, and leave it to the people of the Territories, according to the compromise of 1850? You have greatly the advantage of us in population. The white population of the United States is now over twenty millions. Of this number, the free States have more than two to one, compared with the south. There are only a little over

three millions of slaves.

If immigration into the Territories, then, should be assumed to go on the ratio of population in the state of populations and the state of populations are stated in the state of the stat lation, we must suppose that there would be near seven white persons to one slave at least; and of these seven, two from the free States to one from the south. This is without taking into the estimation the immense foreign immigration. With such an advantage, are you afraid to trust this question with your own people-men reared under the influence of your own boasted superior institutions? With all the prejudices of birth and education against us, are you afraid to let them judge for themselves? Are your "free-born" sons, who never "breathed the tainted air of slavery," such nincompoops that they cannot be "trusted out without their mothers' leave?" It must be so, or else another inference is legitimate and clear; crowd there. With quick steps it was borne through the city; and in less than five minutes, nunciations of the "hated and accursed institution," you have an inward consciousness that it is not so bad after all, and that the only way you can keep wise, intelligent, and Christian men, even from New England itself, from adopting it, is to set yourselves up as self-con-stituted guardians and law-makers for them. I consider your policy, and the tenacity with which you hold to it, as the fullest and amplest vindication of the institutions of the south

against all your misrepresentations, abuse, and billingsgate about them.

I think, sir, I have shown conclusively that the line of 36° 30', known as the Missouri compromise line, never was a "compact," in any proper sense of that term; and even if it was, that it has been disregarded, broken, and trampled under foot by the parties who have lately so signalized themselves as its cham-pions and defenders. I have shown that, while the south was opposed to the policy by which it was adopted, and took it as a disagreeable alternative, yet she never offered to disturb it, but was willing to abide by it for the sake of peace and harmony. I have shown, also, that the present measure is no "breach of faith," but that its object is to carry out and give effect to the great territorial principle established in

It remains for me now to say so on the last part of the speech of the gentleman from Vermont, and that is, the great excitement that this measure is likely to produce. The country was in peace and quiet, says the gentleman, until this bill was introduced. Well, sir, who raises any excitement now? Whence does the opposition come; and what

gislation over the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska inconsistent with that principle null and void. And what is the harm or mischief to be done? Why, nothing but extending to the freemen of Kansas and Nebraska that privilege which ought to be the birthright of every American citizen, to have a voice in forming the institutions and passing the laws under which he is to live. That is all. Who, then, which he is to live. That is all. who, then, is to be agitated at this monstrous outrage? Why, nobody but those who wish to impose an unjust restriction upon a freeman's franchise; nobody but those who deny to a portion of their fellow-citizens a fitness or capacity for republican government. Nobody but those republican government. Nobody but those who would maintain the same policy on the part of the general government towards the people of the Territories which Lord North and his tory confederates on the part of Eng-land held towards the colonies. That there may be, and that there are, some such bodies, I do not doubt. But who are they, and what is their force? They are nothing but the fragments of the old "Wilmot proviso," "freesoil," and "abolition phalanx," attempting to rally their broken and routed columns by this hypo critical cry about the sacredness of compa Who ever expected to see the New York Tri bune and the Evening Post, and such newspa-papers, pouring forth their invocations in be-half of the "sanctity of the Missouri compro-

The men who thus cry aloud now are the very same who denounced every man at the orth who voted to maintain that line, while the question was open, as a "dough face" and "traitor." They thought then that they had the world in a swing, and would have everything their own way. Not satisfied to have "the Wilmot" fixed upon all the territory north of 36° 30', they determined to have it fixed upon the whole of the public domain. With this spirit they went into the contest; and, so far from getting it fixed where it was not, they came out of the contest with the establishment of a principle, which took it off where it was fixed before. Like the man who failed proper ly to use his talent, they had taken away from hem "even that which they had." They went a "woolling," and came back thoroughly "fleeced" themselves; hence their desperation. That such men may rail, and rave, and rage, may be expected. Let them rage on. Had they, and men of like opinions before them, never thrust their unjust and anti-republican territorial policy in the halls of Congress, there never would have been sectional strife within these walls. Whatever of party conflicts we might have had growing out of questions of legislation for so vast a country as ours is, with all its complicated and diversified interests, we should have been saved from this lamentable

quarrelling about State institutions, which threatened such fearful consequences in 1850. But, sir, we are told that discord once reigned in Heaven. The evil spirit of pride and ambition, craving powers and prerogatives not proper or legitimate, entered the breasts of hose admitted even to the presence of the Most High; jealousy, envy, and hate produced not only words, but blows, between archangels ministering around his throne.

"Long time in even scale The battle hung.

These unholy conflicts, so unsuited to that place, were never composed until Heaven's First Born, clothed in the majesty of divine power, arose and hurled the factious hosts from he empyrean battlements to the bottomless

And felt tenfold confusion, in their fall,
Through his wild anarchy: so buge a rout
Encumber'd him with ruin. Hell, at last,
Yawaing, received them whole, and on then
closed— Hell, their fit habitation, fraught with fire

Unquenchable, the house of woe and pain. Disburden'ed Heaven rejoiced, and soon re From that profound deep, below which there was no lower deep, they still sent up much

cursing, wailing, howling, and hissing.
So, sir, in these halls, sacred to national pur poses, and those objects for which the government was formed, we have had peace-destroying feuds and unseemly conflicts engendered and instigated by the fell demon of "restriction," Wilmot proviso," which once stalked, with insolent brow, in our very midst. These scenes lasted until the genius of our country rose in its might, on the 17th of June, 1850, armed with the great American principle of self-gov-ernment, which had borne our fathers through the struggle of the revolution, and drove the hideous monster, with all his impious crew, from the Capitol—cast them out, and hurled them downward to that low deep from which their plaintive howls now ascend.

These convocations at the Tabernacle an at Chicago and elsewhere—the ravings of the infidel preacher, Theodore Parker, and all his weaker followers-are but the repetition of the Pandemonium scenes; there consultations were held, and grave debate had, how the banished fiends should regain their lost estates, "whether by open war or covert guile." These mani estations may be expected. We have had them before-yea, and much more violent too. When the compromise of 1850 was passed, these same men declared open war against its provisions. "Repeal!" "Repeal!" was blazoned upon their banners; mobs were got up in Boston, in Syracuse, and at Christiana; blood was shed by these resisters of the law. The spirit of the north was appealed to in fanatic accents. That spirit answered in prompt and patriotic tones of popular reprobation at the ballot-box, just as it will do again. These threats of what will be the fate and "political graves" of northern men who vote for this bill can fright nobody but old women and timid children. They are worse than ghost stories;

we have heard them before. I recollect well with what eloquence a gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Root] some years ago, in this House, spoke of the deep degradation that awaited every man of the north who should dare to vote against the Wilmot proviso. No patronage of the government could save him; no land office, ever so remote, could keep him from being hunted down, ferreted out, and held up to the just scorn of an indignant constituency. But his prophetic warning came far short of becoming history. Northern men did abandon the proviso. In doing so, they acted wisely, justly, nobly, and patriotically; and, so far from digging their political graves by the act, they have but planted themselves deeper and firmer in the hearts, love, affection, and admiration of their countrymen.

The same "scare-crow" was held up northern men who occupied national ground on the admission of Missouri. It was said then that they would find "their graves" in the ground where they stood; and some pretend now to say that such was the fact. But, in the record I have before me, I see, among the very few from the north who did then stand up for the right against the huge clamor that was raised right against the ringe clamor that was raised against them, the names of Baldwin, from Pennsylvania; Holmes, of Massachusetts; and Storrs, of New York; and Southard, of New Jersey. Where did Southard find his grave? Jersey. Where did Southard find his Mr. Baldwin was afterwards one of the of the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Holmes, when Maine was admitted as a State, was elected to the Senate, and held that highly honorable post, for aught I know, as

ong as he wanted it.

Mr. Storrs, who was a man of great talents never lost the confidence of his constituents. Had he not been cut down by death at an early

ists at that time, I do not see the name of a single man who ever attained high political distinction in this country. Their very memories, in most instances, have passed away, and their "graves," if they have any, would be about as hard to find as that "of Moses in the wilderness." hard to find as that "of Moses in the wilderness."
So much, then, for these threats. They are but the "ravings," and "howlings," and "hissings" of the beaten and routed ranks of the factionists and malcontents. They are the wailings of the politically-condemned, coming up from the bottom of that deep pit where they have been hurled by a patriotic people for the good, the peace, quiet, and harmony of the whole country. We need not expect to silence them; the friends and advocates of the compromise of 1850 did not expect or look for that promise of 1850 did not expect or look for that at the time. That would have been a forlorn hope; and though many of the enemies of the compromise, of the north, who were beaten in the great battle of 1852, have since seemingly surrendered and begged for quarters, pretering to be ready to acquiesce, I must be p ing to be ready to acquiesce, I must be per-mitted to say on this occasion, without any wish to push myself into the New York contest, that I have very little confidence in the integrity of their

professions. They fought the compromise as long as there was any prospect of making anything by fighting it. When whipped, routed, and beaten, then, like craven and mercenary captives, they turned to power, to see if anything could be added to be a second to the control of the compromise as long as there are control of the compromise as long as there are control of the compromise as long as there are control of the compromise as long as there was any prospect of making anything as long as there was any prospect of making anything as long as there was any prospect of making anything as long as there was any prospect of making anything as long as there was any prospect of making anything as long as there was any prospect of making anything as long as the control of the control thing could be made there by subserviency and sycophancy. I have no faith in their conver -never have had any. Warmed into life again by the genial rays of executive patron-age, I have always thought, and still think, that they will only become the more formidable whenever the occasion offers for their real principles to manifest themselves. Hydrophobi can never be cured; it will break out on the changes of the moon. And so with the disease of negro-mania. Sir, the viper will hiss and even sting the bosom that nurtures and fosters it. Whether I am right in this anticipation, or whether this administration is right in its pre

sent policy, we shall see. But we who stood by the compromise of 1856 and intend to stand by it now, and carry it out in good faith, are not to be moved by any clamor got up by its old enemies; nor are we to be shaken in our purpose by any mistaken appeals in behalf of the "sanctity of compacts," coming from a source even as respectable as that of the National Intelligencer. That paper, in a late article, seems to consider the line of 36° 30' almost as binding as the Constitution—the bare "suggestion" for a departure from which should arouse the friends of the Constitution everywhere. If so, why did not that paper raise the alarm in 1836, when Mr. Adams, in this House, backed by fifty-two northern votes, made something more than "a suggestion" to depart from it?

In 1845, when a majority of the north voted against the annexation of Texas with this line it, why was not its voice again raised? In 1847 and 1848, when it was completely set at naught and trampled upon by the north, as I have shown, why was it not then raised? Then the contest was fierce and hot between those who stood by that line and those who were for its total obliteration. For three long years when this contest raged, why did the *Intelligencer* never say one word in behalf of its maintenance and preservation? That was certainly the time for any one who regarded it as imbued with "sanctity" and "sacredness" to speak. It is too late now. The old principle in our territorial policy has passed away, and we have in its stead a new one. We are not. therefore, to be shaken in our purpose to carry out this new principle by any such clamor or appeals. Our purpose is fixed, and our course is onward. What little agitation may be got up in Congress, or out of it, while this debate lasts, will speedily subside, as soon as this new appeals. Our purpose is fixed, and our course is onward. What little agitation may be got up in Congress, or out of it, while this debate lasts, will speedily subside, as soon as this new principle is once more vindicated. Why do you hear no more wrangling here about slavery and freedom in Utah and New Mexico? Because, by this new principle, the irritating cause was cast out of Congress, and turned over to the people, who are most capable of disposing of it for themselves. Pass this bill without great inconsistency. The wissouri question was settled by establishing a dividing line between slaveholding and non-slaveholding territory. Though opposed to that act, the south had acquiesced in it, and had ever been disposed to abide by it. When Texas was annexed, they agreed to it. In the Oregon bill they favored it, but it was voted down by nearly a manimous vote of the north. In 1850, the north refused it. They admitted a few people settled over to the people, who are most capable of the Pacific, not only as a State, but gave them the sanction of Congress to their taking all the -the sooner the better-and the same result will ensue. This shows the wisdom and states manship of those by whom this principle was adopted as our settled policy on this subject in 1850. A cinder in the eye will irritate and in flame it until you get it out; a thorn in the flesh will do the same thing. The best remedy is to remove it immediately. That is just what the compromise of 1850 proposes to do with this slavery question in the Territories whenes. Cast it out of Congress, and ever it aris leave it to the people, to whom it very properly and rightfully belongs.

In behalf of this principle, Mr. Chairman, I would to-day address this House—not as partisans, neither as whigs or democrats, but as Americans. I do not know what you call me or how you class me, whether as whig or democrat, in your political vocabulary; nor do I care. Principles should characterize parties, and not names. I call myself a republican, and I would invoke you, one and all, to come up and sustain this great republican and American policy, established in 1850 for the permanent peace, rogress, and glory of our common country. If my of you are convinced of its propriety and correctness, but are afraid that your constitu-ents are not equally convinced, follow the ex-ample of Mr. Webster, after his 7th of March peech, when the doors of Faneuil Hall were losed against him. Meet your constituents, if need be, in the open air, and, face to face, tell them they are wrong and you are right. I think, sir, that great man on no occasion of his life ever appeared to greater advantage, in the display of those moral qualities which mark those entitled to lasting fame, than he did in the speech he made in an open barouche before the Revere House, in Boston, to three thousand people who had assembled to hear what reason he had to give for his course in the Senate. He stood as Burke before the people of Bristol, or as Aristides before the people of Athens, when he told them, above all things, to be "just." In that speech Mr. Webster told the people of Boston: You have conquered an inospitable climate; you have conquered a sterile and barren soil; you have conquered the ocean that washes your shores; you have conquered the ocean that washes your shores; you have fought your way to the respect and esteem of mankind, but you have yet to "conquer your prejudices." That was indeed speaking "vera pro gratis;" and that was a scene for a painter or sculptor to perpetuate the man in the exhibition of his blest qualities, far more worthy than the oceasion of his reply to Mr. Hayne or his great 7th of March speech. Imitate his example—never lose the consciousness that "truth is mighty and will ultimately prevail." The "truth" as to the right principle of disgreat "truth" as to the right principle of dis-posing of this slavery question in the Territo-ries was first proclaimed by the Congress of the United States in 1850. It was as oil upon the waters. It gave quiet and repose to a dis-tracted country. Let it be the pride of us all-in this Congress to reaffirm the principle; make it coextensive with your limits, inscribe it upon your banners; make it broad as your Constitution; proclaim it everywhere, that the people of the common Territories of the Union, wherever the flag floats, shall have the right to form such republican institutions as they please. Let this be our pride; and then, with a common feeling in the memories and glories of the past, we can all, from every State, section, and Territory, look with hopeful anticipations to that bright prospect in the future which beckons us on in our progress to a still higher degree of greatness, power, and renown.

The Small Pox.—This fell disease has not yet disappeared from the islands. From the reports of the commissioners of public health, it appears that there were 31 new cases and 6 deaths on the age, he might, and most probably would, have attained the highest honors of the country, not excepting the Chief Magistracy itself. These statesmen found "political graves" where many of those who now rail so fiercely would doubtless be very willing to find theirs. But of

## Congressional

THIRTY-THIRD CONGRESS

Senate-Friday, February 24, 1854. The CHAIR laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States in reply to a resolution of the Senate calling for correspondence between the United States minister at Rio Janeiro and the Brazilian government, respecting certain charges for repairs of the United States steamer Susquehanna at that port in 1851. Ordered to be printed.

Also a communication from the Secretary of

Ordered to be printed.

Also a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of the contracts for that department for the year 1853.
Also a list of the civil employees of the War De

Mr. EVERETT presented the resolutions of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, remon-strating against the repeal of the Missouri com-Mr. SUMNER presented several remonstrance of a similar character from the citizens of Mosas chusetts, one of them signed by Harriet Beecher Stowe and eleven hundred women of Andover in

that State.
Messrs. WADE, PETTIT, and HAMLIN pre

BILLS PASSED.

Bills of the following titles were taken up and passed:

Bill for the relief of Ira Day, of Vermont.

Bill for the relief of Gray, McMendo and Company, of New Orleans.

GOVERNOR ALEXANDER RAMSEY. Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom were referred certain charges against the Hoa. Alexander Ramsey, late superintendent of Indian affairs in Oregon, made a report thereon, wherein the committee entirely exonerated Mr. Ramsey from all impropriety of conduct. Ordered to be printed.

duct. Ordered to be printed. NEBRASKA-SLAVERY.

On motion of Mr. DOUGLAS, the Senate pro-ceeded to the consideration of the bill to establish a territorial government for Nebraska. The last clause in the 14th section now is in

The last clause in the 14th section now is in these words:

"That the Constitution and all laws of the United States, which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Nebraskass elsewhere within the United States, except the 8th section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri nto the Union, approved March 6, 1820, which, being insonsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with elsewery in the States and Territories, as recognised by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the 'compromise measures,' is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

The question pending was on the motion of Mr. Chase to amend the same by adding thereto the

"Under which the people of the Territories, thr Mr. DOUGLAS said that the friends of the bill

supposing that its opponents had now all taken part in the discussions to be had on it, had come to the understanding to debate it to-day, Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday, and on Wednesday he would reply, and then the Senate would proceed o vote on it.

Mr. CHASE said that he had already given no

tice of his intention to offer several amendments.

These amendments he would offer, but at the same time he would do nothing for the purpose of throwing obstacles in the way of taking the question. Mr. HUNTER said that it had been complained

that this question had been thrust upon the Senate unnecessarily. He did not think so. It came up as a natural consequence of the course pursued in 1850, in framing what were called the compromise acts. He could not conceive how the majority in Congress, or of the people who approved those acts, could vote against this bill without

the sanction of Congress to their taking all the territory they desired or thought proper to include within the limits of their State. The south got in those measures a declaration that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in the Territories, and that the peope there should have the right to regu-late their own domestic institutions. Practically the south was excluded from the whole of that Territory, yet it acquiesced, and all that was now asked was that the same principle adopted in the Utah bill should be extended to other territory.

He did not regard the Missouri act as a com pact, or as a compromise; or if it was a compro-mise, it was one from which the south had long since been absolved by the frequent failures of the north to observe it. He gave a history of the compromise of 1820, showing that the great body of the south in both houses opposed and voted against it. It was a northern measure. The north broke it in 1821, by refusing to admit Missouri, and had constantly since they yound it. The north broke it in 1821, by refusing to admit Missouri, and had constantly since then voted it down on every occasion when it was effered. How could the north then call upon the south, in the name of honor, and sacred faith, to observe a bargain which it had repudiated? It reminded him of the sanctimonious pirate mentioned by Shakspeare, who carried with him to sea the ten commandments, but blotted out the one which he had no desire to observe. The senator from Massachusetts was in favor of observing the contract when it was to his advantage to do so, but not otherwise.

not otherwise.

The constitution of the United States was ramed to secure equality among the states, to preserve domestic tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty to all. How could these objects be carried out, if one section of the country was to have an unjust discrimination made against its citizens? The whole spirit of the constitution secured to all the states an equal share of its protection and benefits. The states were interested in these Territories in a two-fold manner—first in the proceeds of the sales of the public lands, and secondly in the right of the people to settle upon and use them. If a proposition were made to give to the free States all the proceeds of the sales of the lands, its unconstitutionality would be adof the lands, its unconstitutionality would be admitted. But there was no difference between such a proposition and one to give the people of the north the exclusive right to settle upon and en-

He thought the people of the Territories ought to have the power over all rightful subjects of legislation, subject only to the condition that they should pass no act destroying the equality of the States. Whether the people had any right to sovereignty, was a question which this bill left to the court to death.

the courts to decide.

He then referred to various decisions of the Supreme Court to show the unconstitutionality of the exercise of sovereignty by Congress over the Territories, and held that under these decisions the ordinance of '87 and the Missouri compromise were both unconstitutional.

Territories, and held that under these decisions the ordinance of '87 and the Missouri compromise were both unconstitutional.

He admitted that there was no reasonable ground for supposing that either Nebraska or Kansas would become slave States. He urged however, that the dispersion of the slaves into a greater number of States would be beneficial not only to the slaves, but to their owners, and would, by reducing the comparative ratio of population with the whites, disarm the question of much of its cause for excitement.

He supported this measure as one promising peace and tranquillity to the country. He depicted the grand events in which this nation would be called upon to take part in, and urged the necessity for union and harmony at home, and the folly of being distracted upon such miserable trifles as whether there should be a few more slaves west of the Mississippi and a few less east of it.

He referred to the gallant democratic northern States who had come to the rescue of these questions, and to dispose of it forever—naming among them Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, Iowa, and California.

Mr. BUTLER followed in support of the bill, and replied warmly to certain remarks made upon the south and upon slavery by the Senators from Ohio, Massachussetts and New York. He had not concluded when he yielded the floor, and the subject was postponed.

After an executive session,

ect was postponed.

After an executive session,
The Senate adjourned.

House of Representatives. Mr. WASHBURNE, of Illinois, by leave, in-reduced a bill divising that State into two judi-ial districts; which was referred to the Commit-

ee on the Judiciary. EQUATE LANDS. Mr. STRATTON presented the resolution the legislature of New Jersey, instructing